

REMARKS

At the outset, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the claim amendments made herein do not adequately resolve the issues identified by the Examiner in the pending Office Action.

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1, 10, 12, 19, and 21 stand objected to for minor informalities.

Claims 1-5, 8-15, 17-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite.

Claims 1-3, 10, 12, 13 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kubota et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0171792) in view of Mitsui et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,408,345) in view of Maeda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,123,325) and further in view of Official Notice/ARA (Applicants' Related Art).

Claims 4, 5, 14, 15 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kubota et al., Mitsui et al., Maeda et al., and Official Notice/ARA as applied above, and further in view of You (U.S. Patent No. 7,023,508).

Claims 8, 9, 11, 17, 18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubota et al., Mitsui et al., Maeda et al., and Official Notice/ARA as applied above, and further in view of Official Notice.

Summary of the Amendment

Claims 1, 10, 12, 19, and 21 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Objection to the Claims

Claims 1, 10, 12, 19, and 21 stand objected to for minor informalities. To overcome the Office's objection to the claims, Applicants have amended claims 1, 10, 12, 19, and 21 to correct minor informalities, namely "electrodes" has been changed to "electrode." No new matter has been introduced. Thus, the Office's objection to the claims is moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to claims 1, 10, 12, 19, and 21 be withdrawn.

All Claims Comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 1-5, 8-15, 17-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicants have amended independent claim 1, 10, 12, 19, and 21 in order to expedite the protracted prosecution of this application. No new matter has been introduced. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-5, 8-15, 17-21 meet all the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, as amended. Thus, the rejection of claims 1-5, 8-15, 17-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

All Claims Recite Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-3, 10, 12, 13 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kubota et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0171792) in view of Mitsui et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,408,345) in view of Maeda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,123,325) and further in view of Official Notice/ARA (Applicants' Related Art). Claims 4, 5, 14, 15 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kubota et al.,

Mitsui et al., Maeda et al., and Official Notice/ARA as applied above, and further in view of You (U.S. Patent No. 7,023,508). Claims 8, 9, 11, 17, 18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubota et al., Mitsui et al., Maeda et al., and Official Notice/ARA as applied above, and further in view of Official Notice. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for at least the following reasons.

The Office Action states that “the critical difference between the *Mitsui* structure as applied previously and the structure of applicant’s disclosed invention seems to be that the reflective layer does not overlap any of the electrode attached to the drain region of the TFT.” Page 4, lines 1-4. Without conceding to the assertions of the pending Office Action and in order to expedite prosecution of this application, independent claims 1, 10, 12, 19, and 21 have been amended to recite, in part, “a substrate having a light-blocking portion, a reflective portion and a transmissive portion, a pixel region being defined to include the reflective and transmissive portions” and a “thin film transistor and the drain electrode on the light-blocking portion and not overlapping the pixel region.” As the pending Office Action has admitted that *Mitsui* fails to teach or suggest at least these features, the rejection of claims 1, 10, 12, 19, and 21 should be withdrawn.

All the claimed limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention. Because Kubota et al., Mitsui et al., Maeda et al., and ARA, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 1, 10, 12, 19, and 21, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn. Furthermore, claims 2-5, 8-9, 11, 13-15, 17-18, and 20 depend from one of independent claims 1,

10, 12, 19, and 21. Accordingly, claims 2-5, 8-9, 11, 13-15, 17-18, and 20 are also allowable because of the additional features they recite and the reasons stated above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing Amendment Accompanied by RCE, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested, and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Dated: April 20, 2010
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
Customer No. **09629**
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
202-739-3000

Respectfully submitted,
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP

By: /Mary Jane Boswell/
Mary Jane Boswell
Reg. No. 33,652